

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-19, 21-37 and 39-47 are pending.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12-18, 37, 39-42 and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Microsoft Excel, Users Guide Microsoft Excel, version 5.0, 1993 (Excel). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Excel fails to disclose determining a distance between the focus of attention and the display event, as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action asserts that Excel teaches determining the distance as the "length of tracer arrow," from the beginning of the active cell to the point of the arrow. Applicants respectfully disagree. The applied reference makes no indication or reference to the length of the tracer arrow. Excel merely discloses that a trace arrow will originate in one cell and terminate in another cell. This does not inherently indicate that a distance has been determined. Further, the graphic generating software used by Excel need only know the relative number of pixels between the two cells, not the distance. Further, Excel fails to disclose "wherein the attention shifting display element is determined based on the determined distance, such that different types of attention shifting display elements are determined for different distances," as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges "Excel teaches displaying different tracer arrows depending on the tracer type." Tracer types are defined as: Formula, Error and External references or reference to another sheet in the same workbook. See Excel, page 669. Thus, Excel fails to disclose determining the attention shifting display element based on the determined distance. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over Excel. Additionally, independent claims 12, 37, 39 and 40 recite similar features, and therefore also are patentable, along with their dependent claims, over Excel.

The Office Action rejects claims 19, 21-23, 28, 30-36, 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Excel. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 19 and 30 recite features similar to those discussed above in independent claim 1. Excel fails to disclose or suggest these features. Thus, at least for these reasons, independent claims 19 and 30, along with their dependent claims, are patentable over Excel.

Claims 7, 9, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Excel in view of Jonathan Grudin, "Partitioning the Digital Worlds: Focal and Peripheral Awareness in Multiple Monitor Use." 2001 (Grudin). Claims 6, 8, 11, 24, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Excel in view of Grudin, and further in view of Tan et al., "Effects of Visual Separation and Physical Discontinuities when distributing information across multiple displays." 2003 (Tan). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither Grudin nor Tan overcome the deficiencies of Excel with respect to the independent claims. Therefore these rejections also should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

JAO:MEM/hs

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: November 20, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br/>AUTHORIZATION</b><br/>Please grant any extension<br/>necessary for entry;<br/>Charge any fee due to our<br/>Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p> |
|---|